

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/774,123	•	02/06/2004	Peter W. Swart	550299.00047	8397	
26710	7590	08/02/2006		EXAMINER		
QUARLES			FETSUGA, ROBERT M			
411 E. WISC SUITE 2040		AVENUE		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
MILWAUK	EE, WI	53202-4497		3751		
				DATE MAILED: 08/02/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u></u>			(·
·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/774,123	SWART ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Robert M. Fetsuga	3751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statul Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron the, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 c 2a)□ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr		S
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ction is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Neterences Cited (170-032) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail [

Application/Control Number: 10/774,123

Art Unit: 3751

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 21, 2006 has been entered.

Page 2

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3751

art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 3

3. Claims 1, 9, 11, 12, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brunelle '851.

The Brunelle '851 (Brunelle) reference discloses an air bath comprising: a basin 11 including bottom 12 and side walls 13,14,14'; a plurality of air jets 15,15'; an air manifold 18; a blower 20 including a controller 21'; and conduit 21, as claimed. Re claim 1, Brunelle teaches at least two rows (col. 5 lns. 16-22) spaced vertically (Figs. 3 and 5) from the basin bottom and extending around the basin (col. 4 lns. 42-49). Furthermore, the air jets are capable of functioning in the newly recited manner (in the same sense as with applicants' air jets).

Applicant argues at page 5 of the response filed June 21, 2006 "the novelty rejection based upon Brunelle is believed to be avoided." The examiner can not agree. The presence of even one jet in each of the side walls at the same elevation would define a "row". Brunelle discloses this subject matter as noted supra.

4. Claims 1-12, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunelle, Castellote and applicants' admitted prior art.

Art Unit: 3751

Re claims 1-8 and 10, the choice of jet arrangement (number/orientation of jets/rows, etc.) would appear an obvious choice to be made as taught by Castellote at paragraphs 0040 and 0056, for example. Applicant's acknowledge at page 5 of the response that the combination of Brunelle and Castellote is proper.

Applicant's argue at pages 5-6 of the response the combination of Brunelle and Castellote "would suggest an inferior jet arrangement". The examiner can not agree. Brunelle discloses a row(s) of jets extending around a basin to ensure full body air treatment (col. 2 lns. 47-55), and Castellote teaches air jets can be oriented in basin side walls as desired (par. 0040, 0056). Furthermore, applicant's admit at paragraph 0006 of the instant specification that rows of air jets in basin side walls exist in the prior art. In light of this evidence, it appears the prior art teaches the same jet arrangement as that disclosed by applicant's. Applicant's argue at pages 5-6 of the response the functional language added to claim 1 regarding the capability of an air jet to become blocked is "lacking from the prior art." The examiner can not agree as the structure recited in applicant's claims is fully taught by the "prior art" as discussed supra. Additionally, it is noted applicants' disclosed maximum vertical jet spacing of 5/8" (cl.

Application/Control Number: 10/774,123

Art Unit: 3751

4) would reflect a pressure differential of about 0.02 psi in a water-filled bath. This pressure differential would appear rather insignificant relative to the air pressure required to expel air into the bath.

Page 5

5. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunelle, Castellote and applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Nicollet.

Although the air channels (18) of the Brunelle air bath do not include zones, as claimed, attention is directed to the Nicollet reference which discloses an analogous air bath which further includes air channels 31 that are zoned (col. 3 lns. 1-11). Therefore, in consideration of Nicollet, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the air bath art to associate zones with the Brunelle air channels in order to facilitate body treatment.

Applicant has not substantively argued this ground of rejection beyond noting claim dependency.

6. Applicant is referred to MPEP 714.02 and 608.01(o) in responding to this Office action.

Application/Control Number: 10/774,123

Art Unit: 3751

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert M. Fetsuga at telephone number 571/272-4886 who can be most easily reached Monday through Thursday. The Office central fax number is 571/273-8300.

Robert M. Fetsuga Primary Examiner Page 6

Art Unit 3751